

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 9 remain in the application and have been amended hereby.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended in part to clarify that the functions pointed to in the Office Action at paragraph 2 are performed by the processing means.

The comments in paragraph 2. of the Advisory Action of June 7, 2004 have been taken into consideration in the amendments made to the claims hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended in part to address the issues pointed to in the Office Action at paragraph 4. In particular, the claims have been amended to recite that the processing means increases at a predetermined moving speed a displayed position from an initial moving speed when each of first and second command means is activated continuously.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1 and 9 are clear and definite in their recitation of the present invention and meet all requirements of 35 USC 112.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1 and 9 under 35 USC 102(b), as being anticipated by Sombroek.

It is respectfully submitted that Sombroek does not contain

sufficient disclosure to suggest the presently claimed invention, because the functional description of Fig. 4 in the specification, and cited in the Office Action, cannot be achieved with the circuit shown in Fig. 4.

Looking at Sombroek et al. we see that the user interface shown in Fig. 4 includes four force sensing resistors (402, 404, 406, and 408) connected to control voltages, e.g. 5V, at respective four nodes (414, 416, 418, and 420) and a converter (304) including a capacitor (410) connected to each of the sensing resistor via the same node (412). The output of the converter is fed to a processor (306).

It is respectfully submitted that Sombroek et al. is silent about judging similarity of actions of two command means because the processor (306) of Sombroek et al. is being fed by a converter (304) that can not distinguish which sensing resistor (402, 404, 406, or 408) is being pressed. That is, the processor (306) is only informed of the fact that one of the sensing resistors is being pressed but is not capable of distinguishing which one.

Further, Sombroek is merely teaching controlling a cursor while the presently claimed invention is controlling the speed of movement of a sub-screen displayed together with a main screen on a display screen.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated by Sombroek.

7217/59652

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

COOPER & DUNHAM LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jay H. Maioli". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27, 213

JHM:gr